arXiv:1403.6387v1 [quant-ph] 25 Mar 2014

Reaching Consensus in Quantum Networks with Continuous-time Markovian Dynamics*

Guodong Shi, Daoyi Dong, Ian R. Petersen, and Karl Henrik Johansson†

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate the convergence of the state of a quantum network to a consensus (symmetric) state. The state evolution of the quantum network with continuous-time swapping operators can be described by a Lindblad master equation, which also introduce an underlying interaction graph for the network. For a fixed quantum interaction graph, we prove that the state of a quantum network with continuous-time Markovian dynamics converges to a consensus state, with convergence rate given by the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of a matrix serving as the Laplacian of the quantum interaction graph. We show that this convergence rate can be optimized via standard convex programming given a fixed amount of edge weights. For switching quantum interaction graphs, we establish necessary and sufficient conditions for exponential quantum consensus and asymptotic quantum consensus, respectively. The convergence analysis is based on a bridge built between the proposed quantum consensus scheme and classical consensus dynamics, in that quantum consensus of n qubits naturally defines a consensus process on an induced classical graph with 2^{2n} nodes. Existing consensus results on classical networks can thus be adopted to establish the quantum consensus convergence.

1 Introduction

On one hand, distributed control and optimization have witnessed wide applications on classical (non-quantum) network systems such as multiagent systems, communication systems and social

*This work was supported in part by the Australian Research Council (DP130101658 and FL110100020), the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation, and the Swedish Research Council.

†G. Shi and K. H. Johansson are with ACCESS Linnaeus Centre, School of Electrical Engineering, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden. D. Dong and I. R. Petersen are with School of Engineering and Information Technology, University of New South Wales, Canberra, 2600 Australia. Email: guodongs@kth.se, daoyidong@gmail.com, i.r.petersen@gmail.com, kallej@kth.se

networks [1]-[5]. In distributed control and coordination, one of key objectives is to reach consensus of multiagents on a network [6]-[8]. On the other hand, recent development in quantum physics and information technology has yielded significant application potential of quantum networks [9]-[12]. Consensus in a quantum network has close connection to distributed quantum computation, quantum communication and quantum random walks [15]. However, the subsystems (agents) in a quantum network are quantum systems that should be described by quantum mechanics and the interaction between different agents may involve non-classical correlation (e.g., quantum entanglement [9]). The unique quantum characteristics make the development of distributed algorithms for reaching consensus in quantum networks more challenging than that in classical network systems.

Several efforts have been made to investigate the consensus problem in the quantum domain under discrete-time settings. For example, Sepulchre *et al.* [13] generalized consensus algorithms to non-commutative spaces and presented convergence results for quantum stochastic maps. They showed how the Birkhoff theorem can be used to analyze the asymptotic convergence of a quantum system to a fully mixed state. Mazzarella *et al.* [15] extended the consensus framework in the field of distributed control and optimization on classical network systems to quantum networks. They defined four classes of consensus quantum states based on invariance and symmetry properties and presented the quantum generalization of the gossip iteration algorithm [14] for reaching consensus in a quantum network. The quantum gossip iteration algorithm is realized through discrete-time quantum swapping operations between two subsystems on a quantum network and can make the quantum network converge to symmetric states while preserving the expectation of permutation-invariant global observables. The class of quantum gossip algorithms can be further extended to so-called symmetrization problems in a group-theoretic framework and be applied to consensus on probability distributions and quantum dynamical decoupling [16].

On the other hand various quantum systems with external inputs are modeled under Markovian master equations that define continuous-time quantum state evolution [22]-[24], especially for Markovian quantum feedback [25]. When continuous-time swapping operations are applied to a quantum network, the swapping operators could define a Lindblad master equation [18], [19] for the dynamical evolution of the quantum network. The swapping operations also introduce an underlying interaction graph for the quantum network. In this paper, we investigate the convergence of the state in a quantum network to a consensus state under such Lindblad

master equation. For a fixed quantum interaction graph, we prove convergence to a consensus state where the convergence rate is given by the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of a matrix serving as the Laplacian of the quantum interaction graph. This convergence rate can be optimized via standard convex programming given a fixed amount of edge weights. For switching quantum interaction graphs, we establish necessary and sufficient conditions for exponential quantum consensus and asymptotic quantum consensus, respectively.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the preliminaries including relevant concepts and theories in linear algebra, graph theory and quantum systems. The convergence results for a fixed quantum interaction graph are provided in Section 3. In Section 4, necessary and sufficient conditions for exponential quantum consensus and asymptotic quantum consensus are, respectively, established for switching quantum interaction graphs. Section 5 concludes this paper.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce some concepts and theories in linear algebra [20], graph theory [21], and quantum systems [9].

2.1 Linear Algebra

Given a matrix $M \in \mathbb{C}^{mn}$, the vectorization of M, denoted by $\mathbf{vec}(M)$, is the $mn \times 1$ column vector $([M]_{11}, \ldots, [M]_{m1}, [M]_{12}, \ldots, [M]_{m2}, \ldots, [M]_{1n}, \ldots, [M]_{mn})'$. We have $\mathbf{vec}(ABC) = (C^T \otimes A)\mathbf{vec}(B)$ for all matrices A, B, C with ABC well defined, where $\otimes$ stands for the Kronecker product.

The following is the Geršgorin disc Theorem which will be used in the proof of main results.

Lemma 1 *(pp. 344, [20]) Let $A = [a_{jk}] \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$. Then all eigenvalues of A are located in the union of n discs*

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^{n} \Big\{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |z - a_{ii}| \leq \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} |a_{jk}| \Big\}.$$

2.2 Graph Theory

A simple undirected graph $\mathrm{G} = (\mathrm{V}, \mathrm{E})$ consists of a finite set $\mathrm{V} = \{1, \ldots, N\}$ of nodes and an edge set E, where an element $e = \{i, j\} \in \mathrm{E}$ denotes an *edge* between two distinct nodes $i \in \mathrm{V}$

and $j \in \mathrm{V}$. A path between two vertices v_1 and v_k in G is an alternating sequence of distinct nodes $v_1 v_2 \ldots v_k$ such that for any $m = 1, \ldots, k-1$, there is an edge between v_m and v_{m+1}. We call graph G *connected* if, for every pair of distinct nodes in V, there is a path between them. A subgraph of G associated with node set $\mathrm{V}^\dagger \subseteq \mathrm{V}$, denoted as $\mathrm{G}|_{\mathrm{V}^\dagger}$, is the graph $(\mathrm{V}^\dagger, \mathrm{E}^\dagger)$, where $\{i, j\} \in \mathrm{E}^\dagger$ if and only if $\{i, j\} \in \mathrm{E}$ for $i, j \in \mathrm{V}^\dagger$. A connected component (or just component) of a G is a connected subgraph induced by some $\mathrm{V}^\dagger \subseteq \mathrm{V}$, which is connected to no additional nodes in $\mathrm{V} \setminus \mathrm{V}^\dagger$.

The (weighted) Laplacian of G, denoted $L(\mathrm{G})$, is defined as

$$L(\mathrm{G}) = D(\mathrm{G}) - A(\mathrm{G}),$$

where $A(\mathrm{G})$ is the $N \times N$ matrix given by $[A(\mathrm{G})]_{kj} = [A(\mathrm{G})]_{jk} = a_{kj}$ for some $a_{kj} > 0$ if $\{k, j\} \in \mathrm{E}$ and $[A(\mathrm{G})]_{kj} = 0$ otherwise, and $D(\mathrm{G}) = \mathrm{diag}(d_1, \ldots, d_N)$ with $d_k = \sum_{j=1, j\neq k}^{N} [A(\mathrm{G})]_{kj}$. It is well known that $L(\mathrm{G})$ is always positive semi-definite, and the following relation holds:

$$\mathrm{rank}(L(\mathrm{G})) = N - C_*(\mathrm{G}),$$

where $C_*(\mathrm{G})$ denotes the number of connected components of G.

2.3 Quantum Systems

For an open quantum system, its state can be described by the positive Hermitian density operator (or density matrix) ρ satisfying $\mathrm{tr}(\rho) = 1$. The evolution of ρ cannot generally be described in terms of a unitary transformation. In many situations, a master equation for $\rho(t)$ is a suitable way to describe the dynamics of an open quantum system. One of the simplest cases is when a Markovian approximation can be applied under the assumption of a short environmental correlation time permitting the neglect of memory effects [18]. Markovian master equations have been widely used to model quantum systems with external inputs in quantum control [22]-[24], especially for Markovian quantum feedback [25]. In this paper, we will focus on Markovian master equation in the Lindblad form [19, 25]

$$\dot{\rho}(t) = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H, \rho(t)] + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \gamma_k \mathfrak{D}[L_k]\rho(t), \tag{1}$$

where H is the Hamiltonian of the system, $i^2 = -1$, $\hbar$ is reduced Planck constant, the non-negative coefficient γ_k specifies the relevant relaxation rates and

$$\mathfrak{D}[L_k]\rho = L_k \rho L_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} L_k^\dagger L_k \rho - \frac{1}{2} \rho L_k^\dagger L_k.$$

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a two-dimensional Hilbert space over $\mathbb{C}$. Assume that a quantum network is a composite quantum system with n qubits, whose state space is within the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} = \mathcal{H} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathcal{H}$. The state of the quantum network can be described by a self-adjoint, positive semi-definite operator with trace one ρ over $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes m}$. We associate the network with an underlying interaction graph $\mathsf{G} = (\mathsf{V}, \mathsf{E})$, where $\mathsf{V} = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ is an index set for the n qubits, each element in E is an unordered pair of two distinct qubits, denoted as $\{j, k\} \in \mathsf{E}$ with $i, j \in \mathsf{V}$. A permutation of the set $\mathsf{V} = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ is a bijective map from V onto itself. We denote by π a permutation. The set of all permutations of V forms a group, called the n'th permutation group and denoted by $\mathbf{P} = \{\pi\}$. There are $n!$ elements in $\mathbf{P}$. Given $\pi \in \mathbf{P}$, we define a unitary operator, U_π, over $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$, by

$$U_\pi\big(Q_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes Q_n\big) = Q_{\pi(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes Q_{\pi(n)},$$

where $Q_i \in \mathcal{H}$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Particularly, a permutation π is called a swapping between j and k if $\pi(j) = k$, $\pi(k) = j$, and $\pi(s) = s, s \in \mathsf{V} \setminus \{j, k\}$. In this case we use π_{jk} with π interchangeably and the corresponding operator U_π is denoted as U_{jk} and called a swapping operator between j and k. When we employ the quantum Gossip interaction presented in [15], the evolution of the quantum network can be described by the following master equation

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H, \rho] + \sum_{\{j,k\} \in \mathsf{E}} \alpha_{jk}\Big(U_{jk}\rho U_{jk}^\dagger - \rho\Big), \tag{2}$$

where $\alpha_{jk} > 0$ is a constant marking the weight of edge $\{j, k\}$, and U_{jk} is the swapping operator between j and k.

Remark 1 *The Lindblad evolution (3), as a continuous-time analogue of the algorithm proposed in [15], has been recently studied in [17]. Compared to the results in [15, 16, 17], our analysis is based on investigating the connection between the proposed quantum consensus scheme and the classical consensus dynamics. As will be shown in the following discussions, once this connection has been made clear, various results for classical consensus can then be adapted to establish convergence conditions to System (3) under relaxed conditions imposed on switching graphs.*

3 Fixed Interaction Graph

For simplicity, we first consider the same assumption of $H = 0$ as that in [15] for the quantum network. Let the density operator $\rho(t)$ denote the state of the network at time t. The evolution

of $\rho(t)$ is described in the following Lindblad master equation

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \sum_{\{j,k\}\in\mathsf{E}} \alpha_{jk}\Big(U_{jk}\rho U_{jk}^\dagger - \rho\Big), \tag{3}$$

Without loss of generality we assume the initial time is $t_0 = 0$ and the initial state is denoted as $\rho(0) = \rho_0$. Note that along the Lindblad master equation (3), $\rho(t)$ will be preserved as positive, Hermitian, and with trace one, as long as $\rho(0)$ defines a proper density operator. While the convergence conditions intended to derive in the paper are irrelevant with these properties held by density operators. Therefore, throughout the rest of the paper, we assume that $\rho(t) \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ lies in the general space $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$.

3.1 Convergence to a consensus

Define an operator over the density operators of $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes n}$, $\mathscr{P}_*$, by

$$\mathscr{P}_*(\rho) = \frac{1}{n!}\sum_{\pi\in\mathbf{P}} U_\pi \rho U_\pi^\dagger.$$

The state $\rho_* = \mathscr{P}_*(\rho_0)$ has been defined as a quantum consensus state in [15]. We consider that the system reaches the quantum consensus state and have the following convergence result.

Theorem 1 *Suppose* G *is connected. Then the system (3) achieves a quantum consensus in the sense that* $\lim_{t\to\infty}\rho(t) = \mathscr{P}_*(\rho_0)$.

Proof: We complete the proof in three steps.

Step 1. We now proceed to prove that $\rho(t)$ converges to a limit when t tends to infinity.

Under the standard computational basis, we write the system (3) into the following vector form:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{vec}(\rho(t)) = \sum_{\{j,k\}\in\mathsf{E}} \alpha_{jk}\Big(U_{jk}\otimes U_{jk} - I_{2^n}\otimes I_{2^n}\Big)\mathbf{vec}(\rho(t)) \tag{4}$$

Note that (4) defines a linear time-invariant system. Denote $M_{jk} := U_{jk}\otimes U_{jk} - I_{2^n}\otimes I_{2^n}$. It is straightforward to see that

$$U_{jk}\otimes U_{jk}\mathbf{1}_{2^{2n}} = (U_{jk}\otimes U_{jk})(\mathbf{1}_{2^n}\otimes\mathbf{1}_{2^n}) = (\mathbf{1}_{2^n}\otimes\mathbf{1}_{2^n}) = \mathbf{1}_{2^{2n}}.$$

In other words, each $U_{jk}\otimes U_{jk}$ is a row stochastic matrix with nonnegative entries, which implies that each Geršgorin disc of matrix M_{jk} is contained in the closed left half plane (cf., Lemma 1).

This in turn leas to the fact that the Geršgorin disc of

$$L := -\sum_{\{j,k\}\in\mathsf{E}} \alpha_{jk} M_{jk}$$

is within the closed right half plane. Moreover, apparently each M_{jk} is symmetric, and thus all nonzero eigenvalues of L are positive real numbers. Therefore, denoting the smallest eigenvalue other than zero of L as $\lambda_2(L)$, and letting S_0 be the eigenspace corresponding to eigenvalue zero for matrix L, we know that there exists some constant $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\Big|\mathbf{vec}(\rho(t)), P_{\mathrm{S}_0}(\mathbf{vec}(\rho_0))\Big| \leq c_0 e^{-\lambda_2(L)t}, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where P_{S_0} is the projection onto S_0. This proves the convergence of $\mathbf{vec}(\rho(t))$, and thus the convergence of $\rho(t)$.

Step 2. In this step, we establish some properties of S_0.

The following equation holds:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{S}_0 &= \Big\{\mathbf{vec}(z) : \sum_{\{j,k\}\in\mathcal{E}} \alpha_{jk}\big(U_{jk} z U_{jk}^\dagger - z\big) = 0\Big\} \\
&\overset{a)}{=} \Big\{\mathbf{vec}(z) : U_{jk} z U_{jk}^\dagger = z, \{j,k\} \in \mathsf{E}\Big\} \\
&\overset{b)}{=} \Big\{\mathbf{vec}(z) : U_\pi z U_\pi^\dagger = z, \pi \in \mathbf{P}\Big\} \\
&\overset{c)}{=} \Big\{\mathbf{vec}(z) : \mathscr{P}_*(z) = z\Big\}. \qquad (5)
\end{aligned}$$

Here $a)$ is based on Lemma 5.2 in [26]; $b)$ holds from the fact that G is a connected graph so that the swapping permutations along each edge consists of a generating set of the group $\mathbf{P}$ (cf. Proposition 8 and Lemma 1 of [15]). Regarding equality $c)$, on one hand it is straightforward that $\Big\{\mathbf{vec}(z) : U_\pi z U_\pi^\dagger = z, \pi \in \mathbf{P}\Big\} \subseteq \Big\{\mathbf{vec}(z) : \mathscr{P}_*(z) = z\Big\}$. On the other hand, if $\mathscr{P}_*(z) = z$, then

$$U_\pi z U_\pi^\dagger = U_\pi\big(\mathscr{P}_*(z)\big)U_\pi^\dagger = \mathscr{P}_*(z) = z$$

since $\pi\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}$ for any $\pi \in \mathbf{P}$. Thus we also have $\Big\{\mathbf{vec}(z) : \mathscr{P}_*(z) = z\Big\} \subseteq \Big\{\mathbf{vec}(z) : U_\pi z U_\pi^\dagger = z, \pi \in \mathbf{P}\Big\}$. This proves (5).

Step 3. In this step, we show that the limit of $\rho(t)$ must be the given ρ_*.

From the property of S_0 established in Eq. (5), it must hold that

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \|\mathscr{P}_*(\rho(t)) - \rho(t)\| = 0. \qquad (6)$$

Again noting that $\pi\mathbf{P}=\mathbf{P}$ for any $\pi\in\mathbf{P}$, we have $\mathscr{P}_*\big(\rho(t)\big)=\mathscr{P}_*\big(U_{jk}\rho(t)U_{jk}^\dagger\big)$. This observation gives us

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathscr{P}_*\big(\rho(t)\big)=\sum_{\{j,k\}\in\mathsf{E}}\alpha_{jk}\Big(\mathscr{P}_*\big(U_{jk}\rho(t)U_{jk}^\dagger\big)-\mathscr{P}_*\big(\rho(t)\big)\Big)\equiv 0. \tag{7}$$

Finally, combining Eq. (6) and (7), it becomes clear that $\lim_{t\to\infty}\rho(t)=\mathscr{P}_*(\rho(0))=\mathscr{P}_*(\rho_0)$. This completes the proof. □

Remark 2 *As shown in [15], $\mathscr{P}_*(\rho_0)$ is the quantum analogue of initial average for classical consensus seeking. The state $\mathscr{P}_*(\rho_0)$ is a symmetric state which is invariant under any swapping operation, and thus every qubit in $\mathscr{P}_*(\rho_0)$ contains exactly the same information.*

Remark 3 *In classical consensus dynamics, the graph Laplacian plays an essential role [1]. The matrix $L:=-\sum_{\{j,k\}\in\mathsf{E}}\alpha_{jk}M_{jk}$ plays the same role in here for the considered quantum network to reach a consensus state, which can thus be viewed as the Laplacian of the quantum network. In fact, L admits some similar properties like a classical Laplacian: all off-diagonal entries are non-negative with zero sum along each row. The difference comes from that when the interaction graph G is connected, the multiplicity of the zero eigenvalue of L is no longer one.*

Remark 4 *Consider*

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt}=-\frac{i}{\hbar}[H,\rho]+\sum_{\{j,k\}\in\mathsf{E}}\alpha_{jk}\Big(U_{jk}\rho U_{jk}^\dagger-\rho\Big). \tag{8}$$

Assume that H is a time-independent Hermitian Hamiltonian. Introduce $\tilde{\rho}(t)=e^{iHt/\hbar}\rho(t)e^{-iHt/\hbar}$. Some simple calculation leads to the fact that the evolution of $\tilde{\rho}(t)$ satisfies

$$\frac{d\tilde{\rho}}{dt}=\sum_{\{j,k\}\in\mathsf{E}}\alpha_{jk}\Big(U_{jk}\tilde{\rho}U_{jk}^\dagger-\tilde{\rho}\Big) \tag{9}$$

if $[H,U_\pi]=0$ for all $\pi\in\mathbf{P}$. In this case, plugging the result in Theorem 1 we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\Big(\rho(t)-e^{-iHt/\hbar}\rho_* e^{iHt/\hbar}\Big)=0 \tag{10}$$

along (8).

3.2 Convergence rate optimization

It is clear from the proof of Theorem 1 that consensus is reached exponentially for the system (3), and the convergence speed is determined by the smallest eigenvalue other than zero of L,

i.e., $\lambda_2(L)$. As a continuous-time and quantum analogue of [2], we consider how to optimally distribute a certain amount, say $q > 0$, of edge weights onto the edges so that the a fastest convergence rate can be reached. Given a connected interaction G, with respect to the decision variables $\{\alpha_{jk}, \{j,k\} \in \mathsf{E}\}$ we formulate the following fastest quantum consensus problem (FQCP):

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{maximize} \quad \lambda_2(L) \\ &\text{subject to} \quad \sum_{\{i,k\}\in\mathsf{E}} \alpha_{jk} \leq q. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Denote $m = \dim(\mathrm{S}_0)$ and take an orthonormal basis of S_0: $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_m$. Denote

$$J := qI - L + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \xi_j \xi_j^T.$$

Since all eigenvalues of L are nonnegative and are no larger than q in light of Lemma 1, we conclude that

$$\lambda_2(L) = q - \lambda_{\max}(J) = q - \big\|qI - L + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \xi_j \xi_j^T\big\|_2. \tag{12}$$

Noting that every matrix norm is a convex function, we see from (12) that $\lambda_2(L)$ is a concave function of L. Therefore, the considered FQCP problem is standard convex programming, and thus can be solved efficiently.

4 Switching Interaction Graph

In this section, we continue to discuss the case with switching interaction graphs. Let Ω denote the set of all undirected graphs over node set $\mathsf{V} = \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Let $\sigma(\cdot) : [0, \infty) \mapsto \Omega$ be a piecewise constant function. The obtained time-varying graph is then denoted as $\mathsf{G}_{\sigma(t)} = (\mathsf{V}, \mathsf{E}_{\sigma(t)})$. We assume that there is a constant $\tau_D > 0$ as a lower bound between any two consecutive switching instants of $\sigma(t)$.

The corresponding state evolution of the considered quantum networks under switching interaction graph then becomes

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \sum_{\{j,k\}\in\mathsf{E}_{\sigma(t)}} \alpha_{jk}\Big(U_{jk}\rho U_{jk}^\dagger - \rho\Big). \tag{13}$$

Here $\alpha_{jk} > 0$ is again the weight of edge $\{j,k\}$. The following analysis shows that the generalization to time-varying weight $\alpha_{jk}(t)$ is straightforward.

We consider the state evolution of the system (13) with initial time $t_0 \geq 0$ and the initial state $\rho(0) = \rho(t_0)$. We have the following two convergence results.

Theorem 2 *The system (13) achieves a global exponential quantum consensus, i.e.,*

$$\Big\|\rho(t) - \mathscr{P}_*(\rho(t_0))\Big\| \leq C(\rho(t_0))e^{-\gamma(t-t_0)}, \quad t \geq t_0$$

for all initial state $\rho(t_0)$ and initial time $t_0 \geq 0$ with $C(\rho(t_0)) > 0$ (which may depend on the initial state $\rho(t_0)$) and $\gamma > 0$ (which does not depend on $\rho(t_0)$), if and only if there exists a constant $T > 0$ such that $\mathsf{G}([t, t+T)) := (\mathsf{V}, \bigcup_{t\in[t,t+T)} \mathsf{E}_{\sigma(t)})$ is connected for all $t \geq 0$.

Theorem 3 *The system (13) achieves a global quantum consensus, i.e.,*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \rho(t) = \mathscr{P}_*(\rho(t_0))$$

for all initial state $\rho(t_0)$ and all initial time $t_0 \geq 0$, if and only if $\mathsf{G}([t, \infty)) := (\mathsf{V}, \bigcup_{t\in[t,\infty)} \mathsf{E}_{\sigma(t)})$ is connected for all $t \geq 0$.

These results are essentially consistent with the results for consensus seeking over classical networks [3]-[8]. In the rest of this section, we first establish a fact that the system (13) defines a classical consensus problem over a network with 2^{2n} nodes relating to the quantum network. The proofs to the two convergence results will be then presented based on this crucial fact.

4.1 A viewpoint from classical consensus

Under vectorization, the system (13) is equivalent to the following vector form:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{vec}(\rho(t)) = -L(\sigma(t))\mathbf{vec}(\rho(t)), \tag{14}$$

where by definition

$$L(\sigma(t)) := \sum_{\{j,k\}\in\mathsf{E}_{\sigma(t)}} \alpha_{jk}\Big(I_{2^n} \otimes I_{2^n} - U_{jk} \otimes U_{jk}\Big)$$

is a 2^{2n} by 2^{2n} matrix. Note that the system (14) defines a classical consensus over a switching graph. We introduce the following definition.

Definition 1 *The induced graph of $L(\sigma(t))$ is defined as the graph $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma(t)} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}_{\sigma(t)})$, where $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \ldots, 2^{2n}\}$ and $\{r, s\} \in \mathcal{E}_{\sigma(t)}, r \neq s \in \mathcal{V}$ if and only if $[L(\sigma(t))]_{rs} \neq 0$.*

We establish an important relation between the underlying quantum network $\mathsf{G}_{\sigma(t)}$ and the induced graph $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma(t)}$.

Lemma 2 *Let $T > 0$ be a constant. Then $\mathcal{G}([t, t+T))$ has exactly $m = \dim\big(\{\mathbf{vec}(z) : \mathscr{P}_*(z) = z\}\big)$ connected components if $\mathsf{G}([t, t+T))$ is connected.*

Proof. Since $\sigma(t)$ is a piecewise constant function, we have

$$\int_t^{t+T} L(\sigma(t))dt = \sum_{\{j,k\}\in\mathsf{G}([t,t+T))} L_{jk},$$

where $L_{jk} = \bar{\alpha}_{jk}\Big(I_{2^n}\otimes I_{2^n} - U_{jk}\otimes U_{jk}\Big)$ for some $\bar{\alpha}_{jk} > 0$. Therefore, when $\mathsf{G}([t, t+T))$ is connected, we obtain the following fact through repeating the analysis in (5)

$$\Big(\int_t^{t+T} L(\sigma(t))dt\Big)\mathbf{vec}(z) = 0$$

if and only if $\mathscr{P}_*(z) = z$. In other words, we have $\dim\Big(\ker\big(\int_t^{t+T} L(\sigma(t))dt\big)\Big) = m$ when $\mathsf{G}([t, t+T))$ is connected, which in turn implies $\mathcal{G}([t, t+T))$ has exactly m components since $\int_t^{t+T} L(\sigma(t))dt$ is the Laplacian of $\mathcal{G}([t, t+T))$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 2 suggests that the connectivity of the underlying network is indeed closely related to the connectivity of the induced graph. However, it is unclear how the structure of the induced graph is influenced by the underlying graph. The following lemma holds, which explores some further relationship between the two graphs.

Lemma 3 *Suppose both $\mathsf{G}([T_1, T_2))$ and $\mathsf{G}([T_3, T_4))$ are connected for some $T_1 < T_2 \le T_3 < T_4$. Then there is a partition of the node set $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{k=1}^m \mathcal{V}_k$, such that*

(i) $\big(\mathcal{G}([T_1, T_2))\big)|_{\mathcal{V}_k}$ forms a connected component for each $k = 1, \ldots, m$;

(ii) $\big(\mathcal{G}([T_3, T_4))\big)|_{\mathcal{V}_k}$ also forms a connected component for each $k = 1, \ldots, m$.

Proof. The conclusion becomes immediately clear by applying Lemma 2 to $\mathcal{G}([T_1, T_2))$, $\mathcal{G}([T_3, T_4))$, and $\mathcal{G}([T_1, T_4))$, respectively. □

4.2 Proofs

We are now ready to present the proofs of Theorems 2 and 3 adopting the understanding established in previous subsection. The necessity statements in Theorems 2 and 3 follow exactly from the same idea and analysis as the properties of classical consensus dynamics. We therefore omit the details and refer to the proofs for classical consensus dynamics (e.g., the necessity proof

of Theorem 4.1 and 5.2 in [8]). In the following we just focus on the proof of the sufficiency claims.

In light of Lemma 2, denoting

$$T_* := \inf_t \big\{ \mathsf{G}([0,t)) \text{ is connected} \big\},$$

there is a partition of the node set $\mathcal{V} = \bigcup_{k=1}^m \mathcal{V}_k$, such that $\big(\mathcal{G}([0,T_*))\big)|_{\mathcal{V}_k}$ forms a connected component for each $k = 1, \ldots, m$. Moreover, with Lemma 3, we can further conclude that

$$[L(\sigma(t))]_{rs} = 0,$$

whenever $r \in \mathcal{V}$ and $s \in \mathcal{V}$ belong to different $\mathcal{V}_k$'s. As a result, there is a permutation matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{2^{2n} \times 2^{2n}}$ defining a change of indices of $\mathcal{V}$, such that the system (14) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{d}{dt} W \mathbf{vec}(\rho(t)) = -\mathrm{diag}\Big(L_1(\sigma(t)), \ldots, L_m(\sigma(t))\Big) W \mathbf{vec}(\rho(t)), \tag{15}$$

where $L_k(\sigma(t))$ is the Laplacian of the subgraph $\mathcal{G}_{\sigma(t)}|_{\mathcal{V}_k}$ corresponding to node set $\mathcal{V}_k$.

We further write $W\mathbf{vec}(\rho(t)) = (y_1^T(t) \ldots y_m^T(t))^T$ where $y_k(t)$ is the vector corresponds to the states of nodes in $\mathcal{V}_k$. It is clear that the system (14) defines m completely decoupled classical consensus processes:

$$\frac{d}{dt} y_k(t) = -L_k(\sigma(t)) y_k(t), \quad k = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{16}$$

Proof of Theorem 2. Suppose there exists a constant $T > 0$ such that $\mathsf{G}([t, t+T)) := (\mathsf{V}, \bigcup_{t \in [t, t+T)} \mathsf{E}_{\sigma(t)})$ is connected for all $t \geq 0$. Then Lemmas 2 and 3 ensure that $\big(\mathcal{G}([t, t+T))\big)|_{\mathcal{V}_k}$ is connected for all $t \geq 0$ and $k = 1, \ldots, m$. From existing results on classical consensus (e.g., Theorem 4.1 in [8]), it is clear that a classical consensus is achieved exponentially for $y_k(t), k = 1, \ldots, m$ along the system (16), i.e.,

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \mathbf{vec}(\rho(t)) = W^{-1}(z_1^T \ldots z_m^T)^T \tag{17}$$

exponentially with $z_k = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T y_k(t_0)/|\mathcal{V}_k|$ for any $k = 1, \ldots, m$. Here $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the all one vector with suitable dimension. Based on the definition of y_k, we know that

$$W^{-1}(z_1^T \ldots z_m^T)^T \in \ker\Big(\int_{s_1}^{s_2} L(\sigma(t)) dt \Big)$$

for any $0 < s_1 < s_2$. Taking an interval $[s_1, s_2)$ along which $\mathsf{G}([s_1, s_2))$ is connected, we know from the proof of Lemma 2 that

$$\ker\Big(\int_{s_1}^{s_2} L(\sigma(t)) dt \Big) = \mathbf{S}_* := \big\{ \mathbf{vec}(z) : \mathscr{P}_*(z) = z \big\}.$$

Thus, (17) implies exponentially we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \left\| \mathbf{vec}(\rho(t)) \right\|_{\mathbf{S}_*} = 0.$$

This proves Theorem 2. □

Proof of Theorem 3. $\mathsf{G}([t,\infty)) := (\mathsf{V}, \bigcup_{t\in[t,t+\infty)} \mathsf{E}_{\sigma(t)})$ is connected for all $t \geq 0$. Then Lemmas 2 and 3 ensure that $\big(\mathcal{G}([t,\infty))\big)|_{\mathcal{V}_k}$ is connected for all $t \geq 0$ and $k = 1, \ldots, m$. Again from existing results on classical consensus (e.g., Theorem 5.2 in [8]) we know that a classical consensus is achieved for $y_k(t), k = 1, \ldots, m$ along the system (16), i.e., $\lim_{t\to\infty} \mathbf{vec}(\rho(t)) = W^{-1}(z_1^T \ldots z_m^T)^T$ with $z_k = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^T y_k(t_0)/|\mathcal{V}_k|$ for any $k = 1, \ldots, m$. Repeating the same argument as the proof of Theorem 2 will then conclude the proof. □

5 Conclusions

We investigated the convergence of the state of a quantum network with n qubits to a consensus state through continuous-time swapping operators. For fixed quantum interaction graphs, we proved convergence of the network to a consensus state, in which each qubit holds exactly the same state. The convergence rate was determined by the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of a quantum Laplacian matrix associated with the interaction graph. We showed that this convergence rate can be optimized via standard convex programming. For switching quantum interaction graphs, we established necessary and sufficient conditions for exponential quantum consensus and asymptotic quantum consensus, respectively. We revealed that quantum consensus in a network consisting of n qubits naturally defines a consensus process on an induced classical graph with 2^{2n} nodes. With understandings about how the two graphs are related, existing consensus results on classical networks were adopted to establish the quantum consensus convergence results. The results illustrated the possibility of making use of existing distributed control and networking techniques to large-scale quantum systems. Although we assumed that each subsystem in the quantum network is a qubit system, it is straightforward to extend the result to a quantum network consisting of finite-dimensional quantum subsystems. The consensus problem of a quantum network in this paper can be taken as a special class of stabilization problems in quantum control [27]-[30] where the control actions are realized by swapping operators. It is also worth investigating consensus algorithms for other consensus states in quantum networks and developing control methods for stabilizing the states of quantum networks.

References

[1] M. Mesbahi and M. Egerstedt. *Graph Theoretic Methods in Multiagent Networks*. Princeton University Press. 2010.

[2] L. Xiao and S. Boyd,"Fast linear iterations for distributed averaging," *Systems and Control Letters*, vol. 53, pp. 65-78, 2005.

[3] J. Tsitsiklis, D. Bertsekas, and M. Athans, "Distributed asynchronous deterministic and stochastic gradient optimization algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 31, no. 9, pp. 803-812, 1986.

[4] A. Jadbabaie, J. Lin, and A. S. Morse, "Coordination of groups of mobile autonomous agents using nearest neighbor rules," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 988-1001, 2003.

[5] L. Moreau, "Stability of multiagent systems with time-dependent communication links," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 169-182, 2005.

[6] R. Olfati-Saber and R. M. Murray, "Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 49, pp. 1520-1533, 2004.

[7] W. Ren and R. Beard, "Consensus seeking in multi-agent systems under dynamically changing interaction topologies," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 655-661, 2005.

[8] G. Shi and K. H. Johansson, "Robust consusus for continuous-time multi-agent dynamics," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 3673-3691, 2013.

[9] M. A. Nielsen, and I. L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. 10th Edition. Cambridge University Press (2010).

[10] X. Wang, P. Pemberton-Ross and S. G. Schirmer, "Symmetry and subspace controllability for spin networks with a single-node control," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 57, no. 8, pp. 1945-1956, 2012.

[11] Y. Kato and N. Yamamoto, "Structure identification and state initialization of spin networks with limited access," *New J. Phys.*, vol. 16, p. 023024, 2014.

[12] J. Gough and M. R. James, "The series product and its application to quantum feedforward and feedback networks," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 54, no. 11, pp. 2530-2544, 2009.

[13] R. Sepulchre, A. Sarlette and P. Rouchon, "Consensus in non-commutative spaces," *Proc. 49th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 6596-6601, 2010.

[14] S. Boyd, A. Ghosh, B. Prabhakar, and D. Shah, "Randomized gossip algorithms," *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, vol. 52, no. 6, pp. 2508-2530, 2006.

[15] L. Mazzarella, A. Sarlette, and F. Ticozzi, "Consensus for quantum networks: from symmetry to gossip iterations," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, in press, preliminary version arXiv 1304.4077, 2013.

[16] L. Mazzarella, F. Ticozzi and A. Sarlette, "From consensus to robust randomized algorithms: A symmetrization approach," quant-ph, arXiv 1311.3364, 2013.

[17] F. Ticozzi, L. Mazzarella and A. Sarlette, "Symmetrization for quantum networks: a continuous-time approach," quant-ph, arXiv 1403.3582, 2014.

[18] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems*, (Oxford University Press, 2002, 1st edn).

[19] G. Lindblad, "On the generators of quantum dynamical semigroups," *Comm. Math. Phys.*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 119-130, 1976.

[20] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson. *Matrix Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, 1985.

[21] C. Godsil and G. Royle. *Algebraic Graph Theory*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 2001.

[22] F. Ticozzi and L. Viola, "Quantum Markovian subsystems: Invariance, attractivity and control," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 53, no. 9, pp. 2048-2063, 2008.

[23] F. Ticozzi and L. Viola, "Analysis and synthesis of attractive quantum Markovian dynamics," *Automatica*, vol. 45, pp. 2002-2009, 2009.

[24] D. Dong, I.R. Petersen and H. Rabitz, "Sampled-data design for robust control of a single qubit," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 58, pp.2654-2659, 2013.

[25] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, *Quantum Measurement and Control*, Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

[26] R. Blume-Kohout, H. K. Ng, D. Poulin, and L. Viola, "Information preserving structures: A general framework for quantum zero-error information," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 82, p. 062306, 2010.

[27] C. Altafini and F. Ticozzi, "Modeling and control of quantum systems: an introduction," *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 57, no. 8, pp. 1898-1917, 2012.

[28] R. van Handel, J.K. Stockton and H. Mabuchi, "Feedback control of quantum state reduction", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 768-780, 2005.

[29] M. Mirrahimi and R. van Handel, "Stabilizing feedback controls for quantum systems", *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp.445-467, 2007.

[30] B. Qi, H. Pan and L. Guo, "Further results on stabilizing control of quantum systems", *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 58, no. 5, pp. 1349-1354, 2013.